14 NOVEMBER 1947

INDEX

Of

WITNESSES

Defense' Witnesses	Page
MUTO, Akira (resumed)	33170
Direct (cont'd) by Mr. MOZUMI Direct (cont'd) by Lr. Furness Direct (cont'd) by Lr. Blakeney	33170 33172 33174
Questions by the acting President of the Tribunal, Major-General Myron C. Cramer	33179
Cross by Mr. Lopez	33180
MORNING RECESS	33194
Cress (cont'd) by Mr. Lopez	33195
NOON RECESS	33211
Cross (cont'd) by Mr. Lopez	33213
AFTERNOON RECESS	33232

INDEX

Of

EXHIBITS

Dec. Def No. No			ent Evidence
3090 - D	3455	Record of the Fourth Council in the Imperial Presence held on 13 November 1940 331	.89
3106(30)	3456	Basic Conditions for Settlement of Sino- Japanese Peace	33192
2570 - B	3457	Matters Decided upon at the Five Ministers Conference as of 31 October 1938 33	202
3104(2)	3458	Volume (1) entitled "Japanese-American Negotiations" dated August and September 1941 33	202
3258 3459		Volume (1) entitled "ICHIDAI NIKKI" dated March 1942 (First Great Diary)	33203
	3460	Volume entitled "Second Great Diary, "ar Ministry" printed in Japanese 333	213
3257 3460-	A	Excerpt therefrom	33213

1 Friday, 14 November 1947 2 3 4 INTERNATIONAL MILITARY TRIBUNAL FOR THE FAR EAST 5 Court House of the Tribunal War Ministry Building 6 Tokyo, Japan 7 8 The Tribunal met, pursuant to adjournment, 9 at 0930. 10 11 Appearances: For the Tribunal, all Members sitting, with 12 the exception of: HONORABLE JUSTICE SIR WILLIAM F. 13 WEBB, Lember from the Commonwealth of Australia and 14 HONORABIE JUSTICE R. B. PAL, Member from India, not 15 sitting from 0930 to 1600. 16 For the Prosecution Section, same as before. 17 For the Defense Section, same as before. 18 19 (English to Japanese and Japanese 20 to English interpretation was made by the 21 Language Section, IMTFE.) 22 23 24 25

```
Morse & Whalen
```

```
MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International
 Military Tribunal for the Far East is now in session.
           ACTING PRESIDENT: All the accused are present
4 except MATSUI who is represented by counsel. We have
5 a certificate from the prison surgeon at Sugamo certi-
6 fying that he is ill and unable to attend the trial
7 today. The certificate will be recorded and filed.
9AKIRA MUTO, an accused, resumed the stand
      and testified through Japanese interpreters as
11
      follows:
12
          MR. HOZUMI: I should like to continue my
questions which I began yesterday.
14
          ACTING PRESIDENT: Proceed.
15
                  DIRECT FXAMINATION (Continued)
 BY MR. HOZUMI (Continued):
17
          Just before the recess you told me that General
 TOJO proceeded to the Palace without any knowledge of his +-
 of being ordered to form a cabinet. Vas your answer
 complete or have you anything to add to that statement?
      A I have completed my reply.
      Q I shall proceed to the next question.
23
          ACTING PRESIDENT: There is a loose connection.
          THE INTERPRETER: Mr. Witness, just before the
```

recess you said that General TOJO proceeded to the Palace

3

-1

6

8

10

11

13

14

15

17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

without having any knowledge of his being ordered to form a new cabinet. Have you anything to add to that statement or was the answer complete?

The witness replied: "I have completed my statement."

Q In that case I shall proceed to my next question.

After the formation of the TOJO Cabinet were you present as secretary of the Imperial Headquarters and the Liaison Conference?

THE INTERPRETER: Even after the formation of the TOJO Cabinet did you attend the Limison Conference between the government and the High Command as a secretary?

A Yes.

Q Mr. Vitness, did General TOJO, after becoming
Prime Minister, carry out the desire as expressed by
the Emperor and delivered to him on the 10th of Sentember
1941, the Imperial desire being to return the decision
made by the Imperial Conference on September 6 to a
clean state in order to avert war? Did Prime Minister
TOJO manifest or demonstrate any intention to carry that
Imperial will out at the Liaison Conference?

THE MONITOR: The first date should be October 17.

A I clearly remember General TOJO as making such a statement at the first Liaison Conference called by

him after assuming the post of Prime Minister.

O "hat did he say at that time?

3

2

4

7

9

10

12

/ 11

13

15 16

17

18

20

21

23 24

25

A He said in effect that the Limison Conference, standing on a new position and without being bound by the Imperial Conference decision of September 6, will study ways and means of bringing about a settlement of the pending issues between Japan and the United States.

MR. HOZUMI: This completes my re-examination.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Furness. For the purpose of the record state for whom you are appearing.

MR. FURNESS: I am appearing for the accused

DIRECT [XAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. FURNESS: .

SHICEMITSU.

Q General MUTO, in paragraph 19 of your affidavit you mention reports of Lieutenant General TATSUMI. Will you tell me what post General TATSUMI occupied when you received these reports?

A TATSUMI at that time was a military attache at the Japanese embassy in London serving under Ambassador SHIGEMITSU.

Q hen Mr. SHIGEMITSU -- after Mr. SHIGEMITSU returned in August of 19 -- did you have a talk with him in August of 1941?

4 5

A I do not remember exactly whether it was the and of August or the early part of September, but I do recall having had a talk with Mr. SHIGEMITSU.

Q Can you tell us what Mr. SHIGEHITSU said on that occasion?

had with imbassador SHIGEMITSU at that time, but the gist was roughly as follows: Speaking of the conditions in Great Britain following the British defeat at Dunkirk, Mr. SHIGEMITSU said that the British people were extremely stubborn and that there was no likelihood whatsoever of Britain ever losing the war and that there would be no collapse of Great Britain as some people were then talking about -- collapse of the British Empire which some people were then talking about. He further said that it was extremely likely that the United States would seriously assist Great Britain in her efforts and that no one must fail to take into consideration the extremely great national strength of America.

MR. FURNESS: That is all. Thank you.

MM. BLAKENEY: I wish to ask a few questions on behalf of the defendant TOGO.

DIRECT EXAMINATION (Continued)

BY MR. BLAKENEY:

Q Mr. Witness, did you know that the last note to the United States was originally to have been delivered at 12:30 p.m., 7th of December Washington time?

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please, objection because it is leading.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It is leading, and I presume this is direct examination.

MR. BLAKENEY: I will reframe it.

Q What report did you first hear at the Liaison Conference, and when did you hear it, about the time of delivery of the last Japanese note to the United States?

A It was at the Liaison Conference I think on the 4th of December that I heard of the time of the delivery of the Japanese last note to the United States Government. What I heard then was that the time of the delivery was to be 12:30.

Q Do you remember who made that report?

A I can't say positively, but I think it was the Vice Chief of the Naval General Staff, Vice Admiral ITO.

1 2

4

5

7

8

10

11

12

14

15

17

18

...

2.0

21

22

23

24

25

Q Was it reported how that time had been decided
upon?
A No, it was not.
Q Was the question of the time of delivery of
the last note to the United States again raised in
the Liaison Conference?
A After that, perhaps it was the following day,
or perhaps two days later, that I heard a report from
the Vice Chief of the Naval General Staff ITO and
Foreign Minister TOGO that the time of the delivery
had been changed to 1 p.m., at the Liaison Conference.
Q Who made the original report of that fact?
A I think it was ITO, Vice Chief of the Naval
General Staff.
Q Those hours in question, of course, are the
7th of December, Washington time?
A Yes.
Q After the decision had been made in the
Liaison Conference that the final note should be de-
livered before the commencement of hostilities, was
there any request made by the Naval General Staff, or
any statement of its position made by it, in regard
to the time of serving the final note?

I think ITO, the Vice Chief of the Naval

General Staff, was talking to Foreign Minister TOGO,

but I do not know the particulars.

2

1

4

5

6

7 8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

24

Q Well, tell the Tribunal whatever you heard yourself from Vice Chief of the Naval General Staff ITO about the Navy's desires in connection with the delivery of this note.

A Well, I do not remember the details of what ITO said, but what remains in my mind is the Navy's desire to harmonize the time of delivery and naval action.

MR. BLAKENEY: Was that "harmonize"?
THE INTERPRETER: Yes.

Q What do you mean by the word "harmonize" in that connection, do you mean synchronize?

A Well, this is a general matter, but in opening hostilities there must be a very close coordination
between diplomacy and operations. It is in that sense
that I used this term harmony, in the sense of coordination.

Q Did you ever hear the Navy General Staff representatives express their desire that the note should be delivered as late as possible?

A Yes, I remember what the Vice Chief ITO said.

Q Did he say something to that effect?

A Yes.

Q You had a meeting with Mr. TOGO, had you not,

on New Years Day 1942?

2

1

A

3

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

25

Yes.

Where was that meeting, and how did it come about?

Well, this was just mere formality, Japanese formality, on New Years Day. I called on Foreign Minister TOGO to pay my New Years greetings, and I met him in the Foreign Minister's official residence.

After the exchange of greetings, did the talk turn upon subjects connected with the war?

Yes. A

Can you state the substance of what you said to him in that connection?

Well, we were -- I said that on this New Years Day the people at large were as usual drinking toso, a sort of ceremonial sake taken only on New Years Day, and that it appeared that the people at large were extremely light-hearted, and that there prevailed an atmosphere of victory in the air, and I further stated that such a condition was dangerous. I then stated that the future of this war was extremely serious and difficult, and that something should be done to bring about its termination as early as possible. And then I requested the Foreign Minister that I would like to have him, in the consideration of his plans, to make those

```
which would bring about the earliest possible termina-
1
     tion of the war.
2
3
 4
 5
 6
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

D
u d
n
3
S
p
r
2.
t
t

MUTO

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

0	And	what	was	Er.	TOGO's	answer	or	comment?
---	-----	------	-----	-----	--------	--------	----	----------

The Foreign Minister completely agreed with me and assured me that he would do everything in his power to do so.

Q Was that all of the conversation at that time on the subject of ending the war?

Yes, that was all.

IT. BLAKENEY: That is all.

MI. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, I think that ends the direct examination.

ACTIMG PRESIDENT: Before you start your cross-examination I have two or three questions by a Member of the Tribunal.

Did you take any part as member from Japan in the Italy-Germany-Japan Joint Commission of Experts?

THE WITNESS: I received an appointment as a member, but never participated in the meetings of this commission.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I guess that does away with the other questions.

Mr. Lopez.

MR. LOPEZ: May it please the Tribunal.

22 23

24

2

3

4

5

7

8

9

CROSS-EXAMINATION

BY MR. LOPEZ:

Q You stated that your intervention in liaison conferences was merely clerical and that your intervention in Imperial conferences was nothing but as distributor of copies of documents to those who were attending the conferences. Is that right?

A Yes.

Q When you were the distributor of copies you had the rank of major general, is it not, sometime between October 1939 to October 1941?

A Yes.

Q And when you were distributing copies after October 1941 you had the rank of lieutenant general, didn't you?

A Yes.

Q Lieutenant general is the second highest rank that the Japanese Imperial Navy could bestow to any military man in Japan?

THE MONITOR: Mr. Lopez, you said "Imperial Navy."

MR. LOPEZ: Army, please.

. A As you say.

Q And your colleague from the Navy, OKA, was Vice-Admiral all the time when he was distributing

12

13

14

11

15 16

17

19

18

20 21

22

23

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10 11

12

13

14

16 17

18

21

22

20

23

24

25

copies on behalf of the Navy at those Imperial conferences?

- A At first Rear Admiral and later Vice-Admiral.
- Q Vice-admiral was the second highest rank in the Japanese Imperial Navy, was it not?
 - A Yes.
- Q On November 13, 1940 did you attend an Imperial conference?
 - A Did you say 1940?
 - Q Yes, General.
- A I have no recollection of having attended an Imperial conference in 1940.
- Q If I show you this document marked IPS document No. 3090-D, whose authenticity has been certified to by Masani SUZUKI, Secretary of the Inner-Court Document Section, Board of Comberlains, would that help your recollection?

I see you have not answered me, General. Would it help your recollection if I refer to you --

A Will you wait a moment.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please, I would just like to make of record the fact that more than one minute has transpired from the time I asked my last question.

A My recollection is that I attended Imperial

1	conferences in 1941, but I can't quite recall having
2	ever attended one in 1940.
3	Q Would you say that the document, 3090-D,
4	which has been shown to you is not authentic, under
5	your oath, and would you match your memory with what
6	is recorded in that document?
7	A I cannot recall ever having attended an
8	Imperial conference in 1940. My recollection is
9	that I attended Imperial conferences only in 1941.
10	Q Can you refer yourself to the 4th line of
11	page 3 of the document?
12	ACTING PRESIDENT: Is that the English or
13	the Japanese text?
14	LR. LOPEZ: It is the English text, if your
15	Honor pleases.
16	ACTING PRESIDENT: Well, where is it in the
17	Japanese text?
ls.	MR. LOPEZ: I do not know Japanese, if your
19	Honor pleases.
20	THE MONITOR: Mr. Lopez, would you read down
21	the paragraph which you are referring to, and then we
22	will find the section.
23	MR. LOPEZ: Yes, I was about to finish it,
25	as a matter of fact; I was not through. You had the

red light on me, and I could not follow through.

The line reads: "Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau of the War Ministry MUTO, Akira," appearing as one of those invited by Imperial order to attend the conference.

Have you located it, General?

A The name is written there, yes. Notwithstanding that, I do not recall attending an Imperial conference in 1940.

1 2 n

3

5

6

7 8

9

10

12

13 14

15

16

17

18

21

22

20

23

24

25

Q Would you affirm definitely that you had never attended the conference of November 13, 1940, notwithstanding the fact that you have been shown that document that you did?

A I cannot recall.

Q You have not answered my question, General. That I asked you is whether you affirm definitely and absolutely that you never attended that conference of November 13, 1940, notwithstanding that I have shown you document 3090-D.

A As I have been telling you, my recollection is that I began attending Imperial conferences in 1941. I can say this definitely. However, this document, here, referring to some conference held in November, 1940, does not mention what was even discussed at this conference, and I am telling you that I have no recollection of having attended this conference and this document alone is not sufficient to help me to recall my memory, granted that I die attend that meeting.

Q Would you maintain to the Tribunal that the contents of this document are not authentic and true, under your oath?

A As far as my recollections are concerned, I cannot place any trust or reliability in this document.

Q It is certified to by the Secretary of the

1 Board of Chamberlain. Do you want to insinuate that 2 his cartification is falsified, not true, or not authentic? 3 MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, I propose to object as little as is necessary, but I do object to further questioning on this point. ACTING PRESIDENT: You need not proceed any 7 further, Mr. Cole. I sustain your objection. MR. LOPEZ: If your Honor please, my question 9 is directed to credibility. I intend to introduce 10 the document, not only for its substantive proof, but 11 also as a means of impugning his credibility. 12 13 ACTING PRESIDENT: You have asked him that 14 two or three times and gone as far as you can with it. . 15 MR. LOPEZ: We offer in evidence IPS document 16 No. 3090-D, not only for the substantive proof that 17 it contains on the subject matter in issue, but also 18 for the purpose of impugning his credibility. 19 MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, I do 20 not believe the witness has identified this document, 21 unless I am badly mistaken. 22 ACTING PRESIDENT: He has not. 23 MR. LOPEZ: May I be heard, your Honor, please? 24

ACTING PRESIDENT: Yes.

MR. LOPEZ: As I pointed out, I offered the

4

5

6 7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15 16

17

18 19

20 21

22

23 24

25

document for two purposes: for the purpose of impeachment and for the purpose of proving a substantive charge. Under the American procedure of practice that we know, in my country, it would be proper for me to confront the witness, for example, with a piece of stone, black stone, ar ask him whether the stone is black or white, and if he answers white, I have the right to have the stone introduced, not as proof of the substance of the subject matter under issue, but as to his credibility.

ACTING PRESIDENT: It has been our custom here that when a witness admits and accepts a document as authentic, it can be introduced on cross-examination. This witness refuses to accept this document as authentic. Therefore, according to our previous practice. the objection is upheld; and your proper place to put it in is in rebuttal.

MR. LOPEZ: In view of that ruling of the Tribunal, I would ask permission to address more questions in order to lay the basis for the document.

ACTING PRESIDENT: All right.

In connection with the document 3090-D which has been shown to you, would it refresh your memory if I should recount to you a passage of that document, the following passage of that document.

MR. COLE: Sir, I object to the reading of

1 a

7 8

any portion of this document until such time as it is admitted. Certainly Mr. Lopez can question on the basis of the same material, but I see no justice in his reading from the document, itself.

MR. LOPEZ: I would reframe the -ACTING PRESIDENT: I understood you would
reframe the question?

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, I will reframe the question, your Honor.

In connection with the document 3090-D, would it refresh your memory if I recall to you the fact that with respect to the meeting of November 13, 1940, it was the cabinet that asked that you be allowed to attend the conference?

A It does not refresh my recollection.

Lefiler & Wolf

Would it not also refresh your memory if
I remind you that after great discussion between
the Lord Keeper of the Privy Seal, the Grand Chamberlain and the Vice-Grand Chamberlain, it was finally
decided that you should be invited on the principle
that the so-called Imperial Conference should be
consisted of those who bear responsibility for giving
advice to His Majesty?

A I have never heard of that.

Would it not refresh your memory if I recall to you the fact that at the beginning those in the palace were reluctant to invite you because they feared that the conference might be too balky?

A It does not refresh my memory at all. It appears that what you are talking about is some discussions going on within the palace which has never come to my knowledge.

ACTING PRESIDENT: I think you have sufficiently laid the foundation.

MR. LOPEZ: Yes, sir.

Turning to another subject matter now -
MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, following
earlier practice, may I request that this document be
marked for identification?

ACTING PRESIDENT: It will be marked for

identification.

2

1

3

4 5

6

7 8

9

11

13 14

15

16

17

19 20

18

21

23

24

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 3090-D will receive exhibit No. 3455 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the document above referred to was marked prosecution exhibit
No. 3455 for identification.)

MR. COLE: And may I now request an English copy of the document?

MR. LOPEZ: I think the ruling of the -- may I be heard, if the Tribunal please?

ACTING PRESIDENT: He is entitled to see it.

It has been filed with the clerk.

MR. COLE: In that event, sir, it follows, I should think, that I am entitled to be served with a copy of it for study at my leisure.

ACTING PRESIDENT: That is a matter of courtesy between you and the prosecutor.

BY MR. LOPEZ: (Continued)

Let me see, General, if your memory is better this time on the subject matter I am going to address to you. On September 6, 1941, you had a meeting with Admiral OKA at the official residence of the Prime Minister, did you not?

A I do not recall, but I think I may have seen

5 6

8

9

10 11

12 13

> 14 15

17 18

19

20

16

21

23

22

24

25

him.

Didn't you frequently have a meeting with him at the official residence of the Prime Minister?

If there was any business there were many occasions when we met at the official residence of the Prime Minister, more or less coincidentally.

Not deliberately?

No, there was no case of meeting OKA at the Prime Minister's official residence deliberately.

Well, I suggest to you that on September 6, 1941, you met with him at the residence of the Prime Minister in order to discuss the basic terms of peace that were to be offered to China. Is that true or not?

I have no recollection. If I had any business with OKA or if OKA had any business with me, we would meet either at the Ministry of War or the Ministry of the Navy, not at the Prime Minister's official residence.

Again I show you IPS document No. 3106, and see if this time it will help your recollection of any meeting you had with Admiral OKA.

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

Well, I think you are under a misapprehension

due to a mistranslation. By "Minister's official residence" here means the official residence of the Foreign Minister at which place a meeting was held among bureau chiefs of the Foreign Ministry and that at which OKA and I were present.

MUTO

due to a mistranslation. By "Minister's official residence" here means the official residence of the Foreign Minister at which place a meeting was held among bureau chiefs of the Foreign Ministry and that at which OKA and I were present.

CROSS

Q You recall now that you had that meeting
at the Foreign Minister's residence with Admiral
OKA?
A Yes. This was one of a number of confer-
ences held at the Foreign Minister's official
residence attended by OKA and myself with the
bureau chiefs of the Foreign Ministry and possibly
also the Vice-Minister for Foreign Affairs.
Then, document 3106 is authentic?
A This is a Foreign Office document. I
think it has authenticity.
MR. LOPEZ: At this stage we offer in
evidence I.P.S. document No. 3106.
ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual
terms.
CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
3106 will receive exhibit No. 3456.
(Whereupon, the document above
referred to was marked prosecution exhibit
No. 3456 and received in evidence.)
MR. LOPEZ: (Reading)
"Top Secret
"Foreign Ton Secret
"No. 16 out of twenty copies

"Basic conditions for settlement of Sino-

MUTO CROSS 33,193

Japanese peace(as discussed in a conference with the Directors of the Military Affairs Bureau and the Naval Affairs Bureau, which was held at the Minister's official residence from 2 p.m. on September 6, 1941.)

"The Chungking Government shall join in the Nanking Government, admitting that the fundamental treaty concluded between Japan and the Nanking Government, the agreement attached hereto and the Japan-Manchukuo-China joint declaration are based on the following principles:

"1. Joining of the Chiang regime with the Nanking Government.

"2. Good neighborliness and intimate friendship.

"3. Respect of sovereignty and territory;

"4. Joint defense (co-operation in maintenance public peace, protection of rights and interests,
and defense against common menace.) For this purpose
Japanese troops shall be stationed especially in
Amoi and Hinan Island, as well as in certain districts of Mongolia - Sinkiang area, and North China.

"Evacuation of troops. Japanese troops dispatched to China on account of the incident shall evacuate according to the Sino-Japanese agreement upon settlement of the incident.

8 9

33,194

5 6

7

8

10 11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21 22

23

24

25

"Economic co-operation. Note: The economic activities of any third countries, as far as they are based on fairness and justice, shall not be restricted.

- "7. No annexation.
- "8. No reparations.
- "9. Recognition of Manchukuo."

BY MR. LOPEZ (Continued):

Q General, is it not a fact that the same conditions and terms were incorporated in a document handed to the American Ambassador at Tokyo, Mr. Grew, on September 2, 1941? I refer to exhibit 1245-F, which appears at record page 10,782 to 10,794.

I do not recall whether such terms were incorporated in the document given to Mr. Grew, the American Ambassador, but they were notified to the United States Government during the course of the Japanese-American negotiations.

ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for fifteen minutes.

> (Whereupon, at 1045, a recess was taken until 1105, after which the proceedings were resumed as follows:) -----

K a p 2 е

a u

& K n

5

10 11

13 14

15

12

16 17

19 20

18

21 22

23

25

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Lopez.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please.

CROSS

BY MR. LOPEZ (Continued):

Is it not true, General, that the basic terms discussed by you and Admiral OKA, appearing in exhibit 3456, contain the maximum terms beyond which the Japanese Government never did go, even to the last crucial moments, in the Japanese-American megotiations in Washington?

The plan in which OKA and MUTO participated with other authorities is a plan, as I have stated in my affidavit, in which we two participated, representing the views of our respective ministries, the Ministry of the Navy and Ministry of War. After this plan is placed before the Liaison Conference for discussion and there adopted by the unanimous vote of its component members, then it becomes national policy.

This plan was the basic terms -- this plan, decided on September 6, contained the basic terms, but later, during the time of the TOJO Cabinet, were relaxed.

Is it not true that the stationing of troops in China, even after the peace settlement between China and Japan, was insisted upon by Japan to the last

MUTO

moment of the Japanese-American negotiations?

2

4

5

6

0

10

11

12

14

16

18

19

17

20

23

22

24 25 A Even after the consummation of the peace negotiations between Japan and China it was recognized that the stationing of troops would be necessary for a certain period of time, for the purpose of defense against communist activities.

Q You insisted on the stationing of troops at Hainan Island after the peace settlement, did you not, in order to contain communism?

A Well, I have no clear recognition with regard to Hainan Island, but if my memory serves me right it was recognized that in the case of Hainan Island the stationing of troops was not necessary.

Q You mean the stationing of troops on Hainan Island was not insisted upon down to the last moment of the negotiations in Washington?

A As I have said, I am not clear on that point.

Q Was there a threat of communism from Sumatra, Borneo or the Philippines?

A I can't quite comprehend the meaning of the question.

Q I asked you if there was any threat to Japan of communism from Borneo, Sumatra or the Philippines penetrating into Japan, calling for the garrisoning of troops on Hainan Island.

1		A	No.
2		Q	General, as Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau
3	were	you	not a member of the secret liaison committee
4	with	the	Five Ministers' Conference which had to do
5	with	the	affairs in China?
6		A	I don't understand what you mean by a Five
7	Minis	ter	s' Conference or secret conference or liaison
8	confe	eren	ce.
9		0	No, I said that you were a member of the secret
10	comm	itte	e which had liaison with the Five Ministers'
11	Confe	ren	ce, having to do with the affairs in China,
12	Ко-а-	-in.	
13		A	I was at one time a commsellor or secretary of
14	the 1	Ko-a	-in, the China Affairs Board, but I know nothing
15	abou	t an	y secret committee liasoning with the Five
16	Mini	ster	s' Conference.
17			MR. LOPEZ: May the witness be shown IPS docu-
18	ment	257	0-B?
19			(Whereupon, a document was handed
20		to	the witness.)
21	AND THE STATE OF		

Q I am directing your attention to item No. 16, on page 4 of the "nglish text.

"Yould a haphazard reading of it remind you of your office as member of the Liaison Committee?

A No, I was not a member.

O "Masn't the Chief of the Military Affairs Section of your bureau the secretary of that secret committee, of which you were a member?

A Well, it appears as if the Chief of the Military Affairs Section of the Military Affairs Bureau was a member of this so-called committee, but this committee existed in 1938. It was not in existence when I became Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau. I know nothing about it.

You had no intervention about it?

A I had no knowledge of it whatsoever; that is why I couldn't understand your question.

O You deny the authenticity of IPS document No. 2570-B?

A I cannot deny nor affirm the authenticity of this document.

O Is it not true that under the duties of a member of that secret committee the Military Affairs Bureau was providing secret funds for undercover agents in China?

2

1

3

5

6

7 8

9

10 11

12 13

14

15 16

17

18

20

21

23

A I do not know.

O Is it not a fact that even after the occurrence of the World War in the Pacific you were discharging your duties as member of the secret Liaison Committee?

MR. COLE: May it please the Tribunal, I object to that question, as the witness has already denied that he was a member of that committee.

MR. LOPEZ: It is the last question on that point, your Honor.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection sustained. BY MR. LOPEZ:

After the outbreak of the Russo-German war did you or did you not know whether Japanese forces in l'anchuria were increased?

A I know they were increased.

You had something to do with the increasing of those forces?

In response to a demand made by the General Staff Office I remember the "ar Minister acting in connection with the increase in troop strength and in the transportation of materials necessary.

MR. LOPEZ: May the witness be shown IPS document 3104?

(Thereupon, a document was

1

8

9 10

11 12

13

14 15

16 17

18

19

21 22

23 24

3

1

4 5

6

7

8

9

11

10

12

13 14

15 16

18

19

20

17

21

22

24

25

handed to the witness.)

O Do you recognize the document as coming from your bureau, General? It is on pages 1 and 2 of the English text.

A Well, this is a file of telegrams sent out and received by the Foreign Office. I don't know where the one you are talking about can be located.

O Do you see the "Top Secret" seal on the document?

A Yes, there is.

O Do you see the name of the Military Affairs
Bureau and the date July 11, 1941?

A Ves, the words "Military Affairs Bureau" are written in here in India ink.

O Is the document authentic?

A "ell, I cannot say on the basis of this alone.

"Yould you say that the facts recited by the document are true or not?

A Will you wait just a moment (examining a document)?

General, to save time: I have reference only to page 1.

A "ell, I myself have no recollection of this document at the moment, but it appears to be a

1

2

5 6

7 8

9

10 11

12

13 14

15 16

18 19

17

21

20

24

25

22 23 handed to the witness.)

O Do you recognize the document as coming from your bureau, General? It is on pages 1 and 2 of the English text.

Well, this is a file of telegrams sent out and received by the Foreign Office. I don't know where the one you are talking about can be located.

- Do you see the "Top Secret" seal on the document?
 - Yes, there is.
- Do you see the name of the Military Affairs Bureau and the date July 11, 1941?
- Ves, the words "Military Affairs Bureau" are written in here in India ink.
 - O Is the document authentic?
- A "ell, I cannot say on the basis of this alone.
- "ould you say that the facts recited by the document are true or not?
- "ill you wait just a moment (examining a document)?
- O General, to save time: I have reference only to page 1.
- "ell, I myself have no recollection of this document at the moment, but it appears to be a

study made by some young officer who was a member of the l'ilitary Affairs Bureau.

O Vou recognize that it passed through your bureau?

A "ell. it says "Military Affairs Bureau,"
but it does not have my seal nor any seal, so I am at
a loss to say.

THE INTERPRETER: Correction: The words
"Military Affairs Bureau" have been written on this
document or into this document, yes, but it does not
bear my seal nor the seal of anybody else, and therefore I am at a loss to say.

Q You won't deny that it is authentic though?

CROSS

A As I have said, I have hurriedly glanced through this document and I do not recall this document at all. The words "Military Affairs Bureau" are written in India ink with brush and written into the document but on the face of this document I cannot say whether this actually is a document of the Military Affairs Bureau.

MR. LOPEZ: We offer in evidence IPS document No. 3104(2).

MR. COLE: Sir, we object to the admission of this document on the basis that it has not been sufficiently identified.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Objection sustained.

MR. COLE: I now ask that both this document and the previous one be accepted for identification only. That refers to documents 2570-B and 3104(2). I should have said marked for identification.

CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document 2570-B will receive exhibit No. 3457 for identification only; prosecution document 3104(2) will receive exhibit No. 3458 for identification only.

(Whereupon, the documents above referred to were marked prosecution exhibits No. 3457 and No. 3458, respectively, for

MUTO

```
identification only.)
1
           IR. LOPEZ: May the witness be shown IPS
2
   document No. 3258?
3
        On page 1 of that document there is a
4
   statement "Read by Chief of Bureau MUTO (Seal)."
   Is that the same MUTO?
        A Yes.
7
        Q Is this authentic this time?
8
        A Yos.
9
        Q Are you very sure?
10
        A Yes, quite sure.
11
          MR. LOPEZ: We offer in evidence IPS
12
   document No. 3258.
13
           ACTING FREEID NT: Admitted on the usual terms.
14
            CLERK OF THE COURT: Prosecution document
15
   No. 3258 will receive exhibit No. 3459.
16
                (Whereupon, the document above
17
        referred to was marked prosecution exhibit
18
        No. 3459 and received in evidence.)
19
            MR. LOPEZ: We read from that exhibit the
20
   following:
21
             "Marginal Notes - No. 4.
22
            "Period of preservation: Ten years.
23
             "War Ministry Receipt, 1, No. 691 /Rubber
24
25
    stamp/.
```

```
"Received by: War Minister's Secretariat
1
        February 21, 1942 MAKI (seal).
   A.M.
2
            "/Rubber stamp/ Intelligence Department,
3
  War Ministry on February 27, 1942.
4
            "/Rubber stamp/ Military Affairs Section
5
   on February /date illegible/ 1942.
6
            "Read by: Vice-Minister KIMURA (Seal);
7
   Chief of Bureau MUTO (Seal): Military Affairs
   Section Chief SATO (Seal); MIYAMOTO (Seal); HOTTA
   (Seal); KAJIWARA (Seal); /one seal and one initial
10
   illegible/
11
            "Closed for file on March 14.
12
            "To Intelligence Department.
13
            "Letter Number/ SEIHATSU No. 44, 1942.
14
            "February 20, 1942.
15
            "To: Vice War Minister.
16
            "From: Acting Secretary-General, China
17
   Affairs Board (Official scal).
18
            "Subject: Re Round-Table Conference to be
19
   Held by Liaison Section Chiefs of China Affairs Board.
20
             "In reference to the above conference to be
21
   held as por attached sheet, we shall be obliged if
22
   you will arrange that a competent officer of your
23
   Ministry (desirably the Director or the Chief
24
   Officer of the Liaison Committee) to attend the
```

4

6

9

10

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

conference.

"We shall also appreciate if you will arrange with Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau, who is a member of the Liaison Committee, to attend the meeting at the Premier's official residence on March 5 to hear the Liaison Section Chief's reports on the current situation, and the lunch at which the President and the Vice-President will speak.

"Furthermore, we request you to send us an officer who can explain the outline of the progress of Army operations in the Greater East Asia War to Chiefs of the Liaison Section for about fifty minutes after 9:10 a.m. on the 5th of March."

Q General, in the face of this document do you still insist that you were not a member of the secret Liaison Committee of the China Affairs Board?

A You say "secret Liaison Committee." I was a member of the Liaison Committee of the China Affairs Board. That is where my misapprehension arises.

Q Secret or not secret, General, as you maintain now, was it not the duty of that committee to act as the executive body to handle all affairs of China in accordance with the Five Ministers' Conferonce?

A No, it was not.

1

21

20

22

23

24

Q Coming to another subject now, General, in paragraph 21 of your affidavit you stated: "I never called foreign military attaches myself to come to my office." How about junior officers of the foreign military attaches in Tokyo; did you not ask for them to come to your office?

A We have never called them on our own part.

Q In October, 1941, did you not send for a staff member of the United States Military Attache in Tokyo, then Major F. D. Merrill, later on General Merrill of the famous Merrill Marauders of the Burma campaign?

A We have never called military attaches on our own part. When they wanted to come to see some-body in our office they would telephone and if we were disposed or we were conveniently disposed to see them they came.

Q If General Merrill would say he was invited to call, would you change your statement just made now?

A I will not change my testimony.

4 5

Q And was it not true that in your office you told him, on October 8, 1941, "There is no longer any real hope of settling the problems between our countries by talks between diplomats."

Language Section, please look up IPS document No. 3211, the first paragraph.

"The matter is one for the armies to settle. It is possible that the armies can do this without fighting. Therefore, I think that you should endeavor to report to your superiors that Japan has a good army. I do not care how you criticize us, but you should be careful to say only the actual facts. If you cannot convey to your people the true state of things, I am afraid that I must give you a very unpleasant farewell present. This present is simply that, if an understanding is not reached, you will be fighting us in six weeks in manila." Did you tell him that?

A That is absolutely contrary. In the first place, I have not met a military attache of the United States on the 8th of October. I remember meeting a military attache of the United States on the 7th of November at the Soviet Embassy on the occasion of the anniversary of the Russian Revolution and having taken vodka with him. There is one

more recollection of my meeting somebody from the United States military Attache's Office, and that was a young Captain, a very hale and hearty fellow, who came to see me to pay a courtesy visit because he was returning to his country in October; and thus I absolutely deny the alleged statement made by the military attache whose words you have quoted.

Q Then what day in 1941 did you abandon real hope that diplomatic negotiations could settle the problems between America and Japan?

A Vell, as you would well remember, as I said in my reply to an interrogation made by you, it was after receipt of the Hull memorandum of November 26.

Q So it was not around October, 1941 as claimed in that purported interview between you and major merrill of the United States Army.

A At that time we were most serious and ardent and fastidious in our endeavors to bring about a consummation of the negotiations.

Q In my interrogation of you a year ago, General, I asked you about your knowledge of war preparations at the time, didn't I?

A Yes.

Q You told me then that you knew of war preparations made around October of 1941, and they were

2

3

5

6

8

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19 20

21

22

23

speeded up after the receipt of the Hull note,

3

1

2

4

5 6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14 15

16 17

18 19

20

21

22

23

24

25

November 27, 1941. Yes, I do. At the same time I told you in

accordance with the Imperial decision of September 6, the policy was laid down to do everything in the power of the Japanese Government through diplomatic means to bring about understanding between Japan and the United States; but, to guard against any possibilities of failure in those negotiations, war preparations were also to be carried out. And in that sense I told you that war preparations were also under way.

Q You told me, General, that you knew of the war plans about landings in the Philippines, Singapore and malaya.

No, I did not reply that way. I replied that the General Staff Office may have been carrying on such studies -- the study of such plans. Thereupon, you asked me, why do you know that? And to that question put by you I said that that was the duty of the General Staff Office, that it was its duty to make studies of all possible situations and in that light it would only be natural that they would carry on various operational plans -- for studies of various operational plans, and, therefore, they

Yes.

A

24

25

UTO probably did make a study of such operations. Isn't it true that your office was engaged 2 in the frantic task of speeding up construction of 3 airports in Formosa way back in June of 1941? No. A And isn't it a fact that on the very first 6 day of the war in the Pacific bombers from Formosa raided Clark Field, Cavite Naval Yard and other 8 installations in the Philippines? 9 May the witness be shown IPS document 10 32573 11 ACTING PRESIDENT: Did the witness answer 12 that last question? 13 THE INTERPRETER: No, sir. 14 (Continuing) I understand you have not 15 answered yet my last question. I was unable to reply because you went on 17 18 to another question before I intended to reply. 19 Q Will you reply now, please? 20 Clark Field was attacked after the opening 21 of hostilities. 22 By bombers from Formosa, isn't that true? 23

In IPS document No. 3257, see if you cannot

find on the fourth line "Originating Office, Name of

Section, Military Affairs Section." Yes. Do you also see your name there as Bureau Chief in charge, "...UTO"? A Yes. ACTING PRESIDENT: We will adjourn until half-past one. (Whereupon, at 1200, a recess was taken.)

Whalen & orse

AFTERNOON SESSION

The Tribunal met, pursuant to recess, at 1330.

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International

Military Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed.

ACTING PRESIDENT: With the Tribunal's permission, the accused OSHIMA will be absent from the courtroom the whole of the afternoon session conferring with his counsel.

Mr. Lopez.

MI. Bopon

AKIRA MUTO, an accused, resumed the stand and testified through Japanese interpreters as follows:

CROSS-EXAMINATION

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please, may I have the last question repeated back, last two questions?

(Whereupon, the last two questions and answers were read by the official court reporter as follows:

"Q In IPS document No. 3257 see if you can't find on the fourth line 'Originating Office,
Name of Section, Military Affairs Section."

"A Yes.

	"Q Do you also see your name there as
1	Bureau Chief in charge, 'MUTO'?
2	"A Yes.")
3	BY MR. LOPEZ (Continued):
4	Q This is an authentic document?
5	A. No. This is an authentic document.
6	THE MONITOR: Strike out "No," please.
7	MR. LOPIZ: We offer in evidence IPS document
8	3257.
9	ACTING PRESIDENT: I didn't understand his
10	answer to the last question. Did he say that was an
11	authentic document?
13	THE INTERPRETER: Mr. President, the witness
14	replied: "This is an authentic document."
15	ACTING PRESIDENT: Admitted on the usual terms.
16	CLERK OF THE COURT: Do you want that book
17	identified, Mr. Lopez?
18	MR. LOPIZ: Please.
19	CLERK OF THE COURT: "Second Great Diary, War
20	Ministry," bound volume printed in Japanese, will receive
21	exhibit No. 3460 for identification only; the excerpt
22	therefrom, being prosecution document 3257, will receive
23	exhibit No. 3460A)
24	(hereupon, "Second Great Diary, War
25	Ministry," was marked prosecution exhibit

```
No. 3460, the excernt therefrom being marked
1
        prosecution exhibit No. 3460n and received in
2
        evidence.)
3
            MR. LOFEZ: From that exhibit I will read the
   following:
5
            "/Urgent/ No. 2
6
            "Copyist of draft plan: YOKOTA
7
            "Receipt No.: Report No. 5708
8
            "Originating Office (Name of Section): Military
9
   Affairs Section.
10
            "Subject: Re preparations for aerial operations
11
   in Formosa.
12
            "Term of preservation: 3 years.
13
            "Authorization by: Vice Minister
14
            "Inforcement by: MATSUYAMA
15
            "Minister: leaves the matter to others.
16
            "Vice-War Minister: KIMURA
17
            "Senior ..djutant: MATSUYAM
18
            "Bureau Chief in Charge: MUTO
19
20
           "Adjutant in Charge: MATSUYAMA
21
            "Section Chief in Charge: SANADA
22
           "Section Member in Charge: Kingo, MURATA
23
            "Bureau and Section in Charge: Number: Report
24
   No. 411
25
            "Minister's secretariate: Received, 14 June -
```

```
Completed, 5 July.
 1
             "Joint responsibility: Bureau Chiefs
 2
             "General Staff Headquarters: Acting AKIYAMA
 3
             "Air Headquerters: Acting MORIMOTO
             "Intendance: NDO
 5
             "Section Chiefs:
 6
             "Construction: YOSHIDA
             "Air Headquarters: Acting OS.Ka
 8
             "From Vice Min ster of War to Chief of Staff
 9
    of the Formosan Army (Riku-Mitsu-Den /Army-secret-
10
    telegram/)
11
             "Referring to Tai-Den (Formosa-telegram) No.
12
    412, I deeply appreciate the efforts hitherto made by
13
    your army and ask for your continued efforts toward
14
    the completion of the remaining work in view of the
15
    current situation. In accordance with order.
16
17
             "/UENO/
             "Riku-Mitu-Den 213
18
             "14 June, 1941 /SUGIYAM/
19
20
              "/NLSU/
21
             "Place of despatch: KUFUGI
22
              "War Ministry - 10 June, 1941
23
                                                  Stamp
              "411
24
              "Military Affairs Section
25
```

-	"Secret					
1	"Decoded Telegram: despatched at 10.05,10 June					
2	received at 11.00, 10 June					
3	"To: Minister					
4	"Despatched by: Commander-in-chief of Formosan					
5	.rmy.					
6	"Tai-Den /Formosa-telegram/ No. 412					
7	"The first stage of construction work at					
8						
9	Chaochow and Hengchun airfields have been completed.					
10	Transmitted to rmy and hir Headquarters. (End)					
11	"Names appearing on marginal space:					
12	"Lieutenant Colonel: OTSUKI					
13	"Budget Group					
14	"Military Affairs: OTSUKI					
15	"TANAKA: Kingo, MURATA: KOHON (Air Headquarters)					
16	(S/.TO)					
17	"Report No. 5708.					
18	"War Ministry)					
19	"30 June 1941 - P.M.) STAMP					
20	"Minister's Secretariate)					
21	"Air Headquarters)					
22	"1 July, 1941) STAMP					
23	"Received					
24	"Secret					
25						
	"Decoded telegram: despatched at 13.40, 30 June					

```
1
                        "received at 14.20, 30 June
  2
             "To: Vice Minister of War
             "Despatched by: Chief of Staff of Formosan army.
  3
  4
             "Tai-Den /Formosa-telegram/ No. 572
  5
             "I am determined to meet your expectations
 6 by making further efforts toward the completion of the
 7 remaining work. I ask for your kind guidance. (End)
 8
             "Riku-Mitsu-Den No. 213 /Army-secret-telegram/
 9
             "Names appearing in marginal space:
             "Military Affairs; NISHIURA; Kingo, MURATA;
10
11 MATSUSHITA; TANAKA; KATOGAWA; OTSUKI
12
             "Air Headquarters The 1st Section
13
             "General Staff Headquarters
14
            "AKIYAMA; SATO; TAKAGI; SUSUMU, KONDO
15
            "/signature indistinct/"
16
17
18
. 19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

7 8

Q Now, turning to another subject, General, in the English text of your affidavit, paragraph 15, I read that you called Hitler and Mussolini upstarts. Is the translation into English correct?

A In Japanese I said parvenu.

Q May I know if the English term "upstarts" is exactly what you say in Japanese?

A I do not know.

Q Well, have you called Hitler and Mussolini upstarts in accordance with your affidavit?

A Yes, that is the meaning.

Q From what I could gather from your affidavit
you had such deep-seated distrust and contempt of Hitler and Mussolini that you didn't hesitate to make
known your feelings to your Japanese friends like
Colonel IWAKURO and even to Germans like Colonel Groner.
Am I right?

A You are not reading my affidavit correctly.

I set out at first that in Japan there was opinion that such parvenus as Hitler was not dependable. And following that I expressed my own views vis-a-vis Germany, stating that Hitler at the time of World War I was a mere first-class private, and Mussolini a sergeant.

It is only the latter part that I spoke to Colonel Groner.

t

4

5

8

10

11

13

15

17

18

16

19

20

22

23

24

ACTING PRESIDENT: It may not be material, but your reference to Hitler and Mussolini is in paragraph 19, not paragraph 15.

Q What did you say to Colonel Groner?

A As I have already told you, I told Colonel Groner that Hitler was a first-class private and Mussolini a sergeant at the time of World War 1, and that such persons, whatever they might do, and even though they might fail, they could be heroes of their age. However, I continued to tell him that Japanese statesmen could not possibly do anything in the manner of Hitler or Mussolini because Japan had a kokutai, a fundamental character of the state, with a history of three thousand years, and Japanese statesmen were duty-bound as loyal subjects of Japan to exercise the utmost care to see that this kokutai is unblemished.

Q You told him that you were against the Tripartite Alliance?

A I did not say that I was opposed to the Tripartite Alliance, but I told him other things which I have just mentioned to you.

Q And he smiled approvingly, as you said?

A Yes.

Q And is it also correct, my understanding, that whenever you had a chance to talk with advocates

for concluding the Tripartite Alliance you invariably told them of your very low estimate of Hitler and Mussolini and convinced them that "It was dangerous for Japan to conclude an alliance with Hitler and Mussolini"?

A I am not saying that I said this at all times, but I have spoken to this effect frequently.

A side from MATSUOKA, who is dead, would you say who of the outstanding Japanese leaders in 1940 and 1941 now living who advocated strongly for the alliance with Germany and to whom you voiced your opinion that the alliance was prejudicial and ruinous for Japan?

A I have expressed my beliefs and sentiments to my subordinates, but I have never had any occasion to express them to such a big statesman as MATSUOKA.

Q Didn't you feel it was your duty as one who always attended limits on conferences, Imperial conferences, and meetings of the Privy Council to inform them that in your honest judgment it was ruinous for Japan to enter into such alliance -- to people like MATSUOKA?

A There was no occasion or opportunity for MATSUOKA and me to discuss such matters, nor had I the authority or the qualification to say anything to

8 9

him.

Q Did you express your view against the alliance to Premier TOJO, War Minister TOJO?

A War Minister TOJO knew of my beliefs on that matter.

Q He was also of your belief against the alliance?

A I think so, because I know of no occasion

A I think so, because I know of no occasion in which General TOJO on his own initiative advocated any such alliance.

Q Then we could say that during the month, or two months before the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact in the whole Japanese Government at that time only MATSUOKA was for the alliance?

A It would be more correct to say that Foreign Minister MATSUOKA advocated the alliance, and that others agreed with him.

Q When you say "others," can we include War Minister TOJO?

A Yes.

Q Can we include you?

A I submitted.

MR. LOPEZ: May I have the last answer, please?

(Whereupon, the answer was read

by the official court reporter.)

2 3

1

4 5

6

7

9

8

10 11

12 13

15

14

16 17

18 19

20

22

23

24

THE INTERPRETER: Another expression would be: I obeyed.

Q In the beginning did TOJO oppose it?

Mar Minister ToJo's position was that the matter of primary importance to Japan was the settlement of the China Affair, that all diplomacy must be flexible and constructive, and should not be stationary and difficult of application. Standing on this position of his -- correction, please: I do not know how War Minister ToJo, standing on this position of his, responded to Foreign Minister MATSUOKA in his advocacy of the Tripartite Alliance.

Q Can we take it as a fact that around the military circles in Tokyo you were known to be against the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact, General?

A Yes, you may so understand.

Soratt & Duda

5

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

Q Then, are we to believe now that the personnel of the German Embassy, the German military attache and the German intelligence in Japan committed a colossal diplomatic blunder by recommending for one of the highest military honors that their country could bestow, the man who mistrusted and who opposed the conclusion of the Tripartite Pact?

It seems to me that your statement is a little bit far-fetched. The facts are these: Once the Tripartite Alliance had been concluded at the insistence of Foreign Minister MATSUOKA, the various collateral business related thereto would be handled, in the case of the War Ministry, by the Military Affairs Bureau. In this case the personal opinion or position of MUTO is of no consequence whatsoever, and I must work within the bounds of the duties assigned to me. I was even nominated as a member of the Joint Commission of Experts. After passing through such a course, I would naturally become one of those who would be recommended by the War Ministry as being a candidate for receiving a decoration -- that is, one of those qualified to be considered as a candidate to receive a decoration. Hence, the Foreign Office in Germany did not make any blunder.

Q I take it, then, that as a good soldier you

17

18 19

20

21 22

23

24

3

5

6

7

9

10

12 13

14

16

17

20 21

19

22

23 24

25

merely followed the decision after it was made, notwithstanding the fact that personally you were against the pact and that you frequently voiced your opposition to it in the hope that it would not be concluded?

A Your understanding is correct.

And if I understand it right, that you had active interests in the beginning to see to it that it was not concluded, but when it came you had to bow down to that decision?

A Yes.

Q General, you remember that we talked about this matter when you and I were at Sugamo -- you were at Sugamo?

A Yes, I think on something of a like nature.

Q Is it not true that I asked you the following questions, and you answered in the following manner:

"Q And when you returned to Tokyo you became in favor of such a pact?

"A There was no question of favoring it or not favoring it at the time. I do not believe that the question of the Three Powers Pact came up in the days when HATA was Minister of War.

"Q Didn't you ask HATA to demand of YONAI that Japan enter into such a pact?

"A I have no recollection of having said any

1 such thing. 2 "Q You believed in it at that time, didn't 3 you? 4 "A I had no interest in a pact of this kind at the time." 6 Is that a true reflection of what happened 7 in our interrogation there, General? 8 A Yes. Further in the same interrogation of that day, 10 the following questions were addressed to you, to which 11 you made the following answers: 12 "Q Lidn't you feel that Germany was going to 13 win the war and therefore you were a very ardent advo-14 cate of the Tripartite Pact? 15 "A I did not advocate it. 16 "Q Did you disagree with the signatories 17 formulating such a pact? "A As an individual I was in favor of it, 19 but as I told you this morning, in my official capacity I had no say in matters of policy ... " 21 Does it not reflect what you and I were talk-22 ing about? 23 24 That part of the interrogatory which says that

I approved of it is erroneous. I said I was not in

favor of it.

in the interrogatory in which I am represented as

saying I was in favor of it is a mistake. I said I

3

1

2

5

7

8

10

12

14 15

17

16

18

20

21

24

25

23

I address to you the following questions, and you make the following answers:

was not in favor of it.

"Q And in your official capacity, didn't you frequently advise TOJO that such a pact would be advisable and helpful to Japan in her efforts in settling the China Incident?

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: The passage

Q Further in that interrogation, General, didn't

"A It was my job to gather together various points of view and present them to War Minister TOJO. In the paper that I presented to him, there might have been some statement advocating the binding of the Three Powers Pact, but I have no clear recollection of it.

"Q You feel, though, that there was such a recommendation?

"A I know that such feelings were very strong within the military.

"Q And your feelings, also, in your official capacity?

"A No, I did not personally advocate it.

"Q But you did do so in your capacity as Chief of the Military Affairs Bureau?

....

"A In my official capacity it was my job to keep in contact with the head of the Naval Affairs
Bureau and to finally present the majority opinions to the War Minister."

4

5

6

1

2

3

A If throughout this interrogation you were to say, instead of "I favored it," "I was not in favor of it," then the interrogation would be correct.

7

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: Strike out "interrogation" and insert "interrogatory."

9

11

12

Q General, in paragraph 20 of your affidavit, you talk of KONOYE's new party movement. That movement gained great momentum after the fall of France in June, 1940, when the Japanese military threw its whole support behind it, isn't it true?

13 14

15

16

17

Did not the army support the new political movement because the movement called for the dissolution of existing political parties, the strengthening of the Japanese-German-Italian Axis, the conservation of the China gains, and establishment of a new order in

18 19

the China gains, and establishment of a new order in East Asia in parallel to the new order in Europe?

20

A I don't know what you read from.

22

Q Is it true or is it not true?

24

25

A It is a fact that the army agreed to approve -approved of Prince KONOYE's movement for a new party to
bring about a renovation of the domostic situation.

3

5

6 7

8 9

10

12

11

13 14

15 16

17

18

19

20 21

22 23

24 25

"A In my official capacity it was my job to keep in contact with the head of the Naval Affairs Bureau and to finally present the majority opinions to the War Minister."

If throughout this interrogation you were to say, instead of "I favored it," "I was not in favor of it," then the interrogation would be correct.

THE MONITOR: Slight correction: Strike out "interrogation" and insert "interrogatory."

General, in paragraph 20 of your affidavit, you talk of KONOYE's new party movement. That movement gained great momentum after the fall of France in June, 1940, when the Japanese military threw its whole support behind it, isn't it true?

Did not the army support the new political movement because the movement called for the dissolution of existing political parties, the strengthening of the Japanese-German-Italian Axis, the conservation of the China gains, and establishment of a new order in East Asia in parallel to the new order in Europe?

- A I don't know what you read from.
- Q Is it true or is it not true?
- It is a fact that the army agreed to approve -approved of Prince KONOYE's movement for a new party to bring about a renovation of the domostic situation.

Q Isn't it true that the army wanted KONOYE to replace YONAI as Premier?

A It was thought desirable that if there should be a change in cabinet following the resignation of the YONAI Cabinet that it would be desirable to have KONOYE head the succeeding cabinet.

Q You state in paragraph 20 of your affidavit that the conclusion of the Tri-Partite Pact was not pressed upon the government, and that HATA supported the YONAI Cabinet policy of noninvolvement in the European War.

Isn't it true that about the beginning of July 1940 it was already publicly known in Japan that in military circles the sentiment was gaining to alter the diplomatic policy of noninvolvement in the European War and instead promote KONOYE's movement for a new political structure and strengthen the Japanese-German-Italian Axis?

A That is entirely contrary to facts, and the matter could not have been publicly known.

Q Was it not known very widely at the time, even in the press of Japan, that HATA was going to visit YONAI and advise him to strengthen the Japanese-German-Italian Axis and support the new political structure movement?

5

1

9

10

12

13

14

16

17

18

19

20

22

23

24

A In so far as I know that is entirely contrary to the ideas and intentions of General HATA.

Q Are you familiar with the Tokyo Nichi Nichi, just published here in Japan before the war?

A Yes, I do.

Q If I read to you the headline of Nichi Nichi of 10 July 1940, would that give you any recollection of the fact that HATA was going to visit YONAI in order to have the policy of noninvolvement altered and to strengthen the Tri-Partite Axis? What is your answer, please?

A Well, it does not refresh my memory. I thought you were going to read it for me.

MR. LOPEZ: May the witness be shown document 3184-B?

(Whereupon, a document was handed to the witness.)

A Well, there seems to be a very big playup in this newspaper about a probable advice to be given by General HATA to the Prime Minister, but this is entirely contrary to fact, and I do not believe that any such advice was ever given.

Q The Nichi Nichi had quite a circulation in Japan at the time, didn't it?

A Yes, the circulation seems to have been large.

Q	Would	you	say	over	a	million	a	day?

A That I do not know.

Q What portion of that story, news story in 3184-B do you affirm to be not truthful or reflective of the facts?

A Well, the entire news item is a sort of prediction story, and I deny the entire contents.

Q Sometime in the middle of July, 1940, you and Vice-Minister ANAMI demanded of Chief Secretary ISHIWATA the mass resignation of the cabinet in order to realize KONOYE's political order, and when ISHI-WATA refused your demand you and ANAMI stated to him that there was nothing to be done but call for the resignation of HATA.

Did it not come to your notice that YONAI on the next day mentioned the incident to HATA, who replied that that opinion expressed by you and General ANAMI was only your own personal opinion?

A That also is contrary to fact.

Q Isn't it true that on July 16, 1940 War
Minister HATA, after conferring with you, General
ANAMI, the Big Three, and the War Councilors, finally
handed in his resignation to YONAI in order to enforce
the will of the army?

A That, too, so far as I am concerned is also

incorrect.

MR. LOPEZ: If the Tribunal please, at this stage of the proceedings, 2:30 in the afternoon, I do not feel that I can go on with the cross-examination of this witness. I have not been feeling very well. I have been trying to do my best to cooperate with the Tribunal, but my head has been dizzy and I can't catch what you are saying to me. I would take advantage of an instruction given for me to stop at exactly 2:30 with my cross-examination.

I apologize to the Tribunal about the confused and disordered state of my cross-examination and my inability to ask this witness about questions based on documents which I feel are important in enforcing the case of the prosecution.

ACTING PRESIDENT: The Tribunal is certainly not going to instruct you to stop your cross-examination. That is at your discretion.

Mr. Tavenner.

MR. TAVENNER: If it please the Tribunal, quite apparently counsel is not well at the moment. I believe if the Tribunal would take its usual fifteen-minute recess at this time that he may be prepared to go on with his cross-examination at the end of that time, which I hope he will.

	ACTING PRESIDENT: We will recess for
fift	een minutes.
	(Whereupon, at 1435, a recess was
	taken until 1500, after which the proceed-
	ings were resumed as follows:)
	TIED HOTO TODAMO ST.
15 3	
H	

33,233 MUTO

MARSHAL OF THE COURT: The International Mili-K n tary Tribunal for the Far East is now resumed. a p ACTING PRESIDENT: Mr. Tavenner. p 3 MR. TAVENNER: If the Tribunal please, I regret & 4 very much to advise the Tribunal that the physician in the dispensary here has told us that under no condi-6

> examination today. During this recess I have endeavored to get ready the testimony that was taken on commission and have it read this afternoon, but at least one counsel who is interested in making objections is not present,

tions should Major Lopez continue with the cross-

13 and we cannot present that.

> In order to save time, counsel for OKA, the next accused whose phase will be presented, is ready to proceed with his phase if it is agreeable to counsel for MUTO. If it is agreeable to counsel for MUTO we would like to ask that the cross-examination be suspended until Monday morning.

ACTING PRESIDENT: Whether or not it is agreeable to the counsel for MUTO, the Tribunal feels that they do not care to have the cross-examination of the accused MUTO interrupted at this time. Under those circumstances, the Court feels that it should adjourn until 9:30 Monday morning, and in case Mr. Lopez is not

K a pi

a

12

8

9

10

11

14

15

16 17

18

19

21 22

20

23

able to continue the cross-examination Monday morning, we feel that the prosecution should have somebody else ready to take up the cross-etamination.

The Court will adjourn until 9:30 Monday morning.

(Whereupon, at 1507, an adjournment was taken until Monday merning, 17 November 1947, at 0930.)